

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-7 and 9-10 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 are sought to be amended to further clarify the invention, and claims 8 and 12 are sought to be canceled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Drawings:

Replacement drawings have been filed herewith for FIGs. 1 and 2 to indicate --Prior Art-- in the legend.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

On pages 2-3, claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 8, the Office Action alleges that the phrase "the first and second resistor ladders" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 8 has been canceled rendering this rejection moot.

Regarding claim 9, the Office Action alleges that the phrase "the resistor ladders" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 9 has been amended to correct the mentioned antecedent basis.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be removed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). (e.g. FIG. 2) Claims 5-11 also stand rejected over as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0168279 to Behzad (hereinafter "Behzad"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that:

the first plurality of switches are connected in a first matrix having *two or more rows and two or more columns*,and

the second plurality of switches are connected in a second matrix having *two or more rows and two or more columns*.

(See, Claim 1, emphasis)

Applicant asserts that it is clear that AAPA (FIGs. 1-2) do not include the *italicized features* mentioned above. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated by AAPA for at least the *italicized features* mentioned above, in addition to other patentable features of claim 1.

Independent claims 5, 9, and 10 have been amended in a similar fashion. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that AAPA does not teach each and every feature of amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 10, and therefore does not anticipate these claims.

Upon review of the mentioned figure FIG. 22 of Behzad and the corresponding specification, Applicant asserts that it is also clear that Behzad also does not teach *a programmable gain amplifier having the switches in a matrix having two or more rows and two or more columns, where the some of the switches are turned on for interpolation*.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Behzad does not teach each and every feature of amended independent claims 5, 9, and 10, and therefore does not anticipate these claims.

Based on the discussion above, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance. Claim 2 is patentable for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to its own patentable features. Claim 11 is canceled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 6, and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being anticipated by AAPA in view of Behzad. Applicant traverses this rejection below.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 6 depends from independent claim 5. As discussed above, amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 are patentable over AAPA and Behzad for the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, the dependent claims 2, and 6 are patentable for being dependent from an allowable base claim in addition to their own patentable features. Claim 10, as amended, is non-obvious over AAPA and Behzad for the same reasons mentioned above for independent claim 1. Claim 11 is canceled.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be removed and that claims 2, 6, and 10 be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be

Arya R. Behzad
Appl. No. 10/830,112

withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 9/6/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

508237_1.DOC